

Römer and Schreiber reply: The enhancement of the localization length for two interacting particles is vanishingly small in transfer-matrix calculations

Before replying in detail to (i)-(iii) of [1], we point out that as already discussed in [2] there is no “consistent picture” for the enhancement of the localization length λ_2 for two interacting particles (TIP) [3]. In fact there are at least 3 different proposals [3–5] for the dependence of λ_2 on interaction U and disorder W . Analytical and numerical work [4] following Shepelyansky’s original approach [3] neglects the phase correlations inherent in the interference phenomena of localization. We believe that this is a very serious approximation and question it on physical grounds [6]. In [2] we concentrated on a numerical approach [7] based on the transfer-matrix method (TMM). Our results led us only to “conclude that the TMM ... measures an enhancement ... which is ... due to the finiteness of the systems”. In particular, we did not question the results of v. Oppen et al. [5] reproduced in the Comment. We also note that we [2] explore the limit of large system size M and not the “thermodynamic limit” [1]. The latter implies of course a finite particle density quite different from the TIP problem. In any case, λ_2 does not correspond to “extended states” [1], because it remains finite and smaller than M . Finally, to the best of our knowledge, there is no “scaling theory of localization” [1] for TIP. One might want to argue that the TIP problem can be viewed as a noninteracting Anderson model in 2D with correlated disorder and as such is subject to the scaling theory of localization for non-interacting electrons. However, it is well known that correlations in the disorder potential lead to results which violate scaling theory, e.g. the quasi-periodic Aubry-André model [8] exhibits a metal-insulator transition in 1D. For TIP the problem is equally severe because the correlation length of the disorder is equal to the system size.

(i) Our self-averaging TMM gives the same data within the statistical accuracy as the unsymmetrized TMM of Frahm et al. [7]. We checked this explicitly up to $M = 150$ for $U = 0$ and $U = 1$ and find that λ_2 of both methods shrinks equally when increasing M . Also, for a 2D Anderson model and $W = 10$, a TMM gives the decay length $\lambda_1 = 5.26$ for $M = 100 \approx 20\lambda_1$. Increasing to $M = 150$ changes λ_1 by 4%. From the TIP data for $U = 1$ [2], we see a 13% change of λ_2 for these sizes. Thus the percentual changes are different but not dramatically so. We note that the reasoning of Ref. [1] based on changes of λ with M had previously lead to the erroneous proposal of a critical disorder $W_c \approx 6$ in 2D [9]. In contrast, Thouless’ ideas are based on changes in the *energy* spectrum.

(ii) The exact diagonalization in [11] yields no quantitative estimates of λ_2 and no value for α in $\lambda_2 \sim U^2 \lambda_1^\alpha$ [3]. The Green function approach was used [5] to approximate for onsite interacting bosons or nearest-neighbor interacting fermions the decay of the TIP Green function along the diagonal. Its prediction of $\lambda_2 \sim |U|$ does not agree with Ref. [3] and no other method supports the

derived scaling parameter $U\lambda_1$. The (unsymmetrized) TMM [2,7] is presently the only method which directly measures λ_2 without approximations. However, due to the symmetry of the disorder potential [2], the TMM does not give $\lambda_2(U = 0) = \lambda_1$ for finite M . Therefore one should rather discuss [2] the enhancement $\lambda_2(1)/\lambda_2(0)$ which turns out to be much smaller for all W and M than $\lambda_2(1)/\lambda_1$ considered in [7]. Furthermore, it vanishes for $M \rightarrow \infty$. Frahm et al. also argue [1] that a symmetrized TMM [7] shows the TIP enhancement but the enhancement is shown in Fig. 3 of Ref. [7] for an interaction of range 20, and again $\lambda(0) \approx \lambda(1)$. Furthermore, the “bag” in this TMM means an artificial infinite attraction whenever the particles are M sites apart.

(iii) In Ref. [7] Frahm et al. considered $U = 1$ and $W \in [1.4, 4]$ for $M = 100$ for the unsymmetrized TMM and $M \leq 300$ for the bag model. We showed [2] data for $W \in [1.4, 10]$, $U \in [0, 4]$ and $M \leq 360$. Our λ_2 ’s are in agreement with Ref. [7]. It appears therefore unlikely that we missed the appropriate “scale”. Furthermore, the TMM inherently measures “the largest possible localization length” [9] in the system and the presence of other shorter decay lengths does not affect the result. Thus it is not necessary to “suppress” any λ_1 scale.

We leave open the possibility that a method different from TMM gives an enhancement $\lambda_2(1)/\lambda_2(0)$ for two onsite interacting electrons (Fig. 1 in [1] does not). However, taking into account the phase correlations, we believe this to be unlikely [6]. Finally, we note that the TIP enhancement applies to only $\mathcal{O}(M)$ out of M^2 (unsymmetrized) states somewhere in the band. The relevance for transport properties in many-body systems close to the ground state remains to be demonstrated.

Rudolf A. Römer and Michael Schreiber
Institut für Physik, Technische Universität
D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany

(Version February 27, 1997, printed: February 7, 2008)
PACS numbers: 71.55.Jv, 72.15.Rn, 72.10.Bg

-
- [1] K. Frahm et al., preprint (1997, cond-mat 9702084).
 - [2] R.A.Römer, M.Schreiber, Phys.Rev.Lett.**78**, 515 (1997).
 - [3] D. L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2607 (1994).
 - [4] Y. Imry, Europhys. Lett. **30**, 405 (1995); D. Weinmann, J.-L. Pichard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1556 (1996); K. Frahm et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1509 (1996).
 - [5] F. v. Oppen et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 491 (1996).
 - [6] T. Vojta, R. A. Römer, and M. Schreiber, preprint (1997, cond-mat 9702241).
 - [7] K. Frahm et al., Europhys. Lett. **31**, 169 (1995).
 - [8] S. Aubry, G. André, Ann. Israel Phys. Soc. **3**, 133 (1980).
 - [9] J.-L. Pichard, G. Sarma, J. Phys. C **14**, L217 (1981).
 - [10] M.Schreiber, H.Grußbach, Phys.Rev.Lett.**67**, 607 (1991).
 - [11] D. Weinmann et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1598 (1995).